

News-SOCIAL Letter ACTION

XIV, No. 6

Indianapolis, Indiana

June, 1950

Have We Given Up Hope Of Peace?

Has the United States given up hope for peace with Russia? Are we now turning to rearmament for a conflict which we believe to be inevitable? Certain events lend the color of credibility to such a supposition. The loss of an American bomber over the Baltic on what we declare was a peaceful flight to a Swedish base, but which Russia declares was taking pictures of its Baltic bases, greatly increased the already serious tension in Soviet-American relations. Reports, contradictory and officially unverified, that unidentified submarines were discovered cruising off both our Pacific and Atlantic coasts have added to the tension. Recent pressure of the United States, to seat the

Chinese Communist delegation to the United Nations has resulted in a Soviet ultimatum that has brought the internationalization to a stalemate and has sent Secretary General Trygve Lie to be and to Moscow to see what he can do about it. He is on record as saying that fate of the UN is at stake.

Are the proposals of Senator Tydings (Md.) that the nations disarm "down to the bone" and of Senator Brian McMahon (Conn.) that the nations disarm two-thirds and use the savings to strengthen the world's economic life desperate efforts to stop the drift toward conflict? Was Senator McMahon's proposal that this country undertake a \$50 billion welfare project to aid the needy peoples of the world another desperate effort to stop the drift toward conflict?

And why did Defense Secretary Johnson, after his repeated assertions that economy is needed in defense spending, propose a budget that could be effected within the next year, go before the House Appropriations Committee on April 26, to ask for an additional \$1 billion for the 1951 defense budget? And why did the Committee, already exercised over a budget deficit of \$6.7 billion for 1950, vote to approve a request within 30 minutes after it was made? Secretary Johnson's Armed Forces speech (May 20) carried that same note of fear of attack and urgency of preparation. Was this another effort to further increase the fears — if any economy is needed — of the American people and thus make an arms race more acceptable to them?

And since we are asking questions, why did Rep. Carl Vinson, chairman of the Armed Services Committee reverse himself and come out for extension of the Selective Service Act when less than 90 days before he publicly stated that he would permit the draft law to die and would sponsor a manpower mobilization bill?

Harold Callender, in dispatches to the *New York Times*, says the United States faces the task of re-arming Europe after the termination of the Marshall Plan. Joseph Alsop, political commentator, says it will be necessary for the United States to increase its spending for military preparedness from \$3 billion to

(Continued on page 4, col. 1)

They Sponsor DPs

"Our church here would like to sponsor a DP family . . ." Thus began the interesting story of how the Niantic, Illinois Christian Church and the Niantic community have become the sponsors of two displaced persons families.

Sometime during late 1949 the chairman of the committee which was appointed to work on the project received a letter of thanks for some clothing from a girl in a DP camp in Germany. The woman had put her name and address in a package of clothing she had sent for relief so the girl knew where to write. She is the eldest daughter of four children and in her letter she gave a bit of the history of her family — "We fled at night when our village was full of flames and the battle was fought in the street. We saved only our lives, nothing else, everything was lost." She mentioned the difficult life in the camp — "Here in Germany we are living in a camp without any job and we cannot get any living . . . We are six together . . ."

That personal touch aroused the interest of the committee and the church people. More correspondence followed. The Niantic church people sent food and clothing parcels. Finally, the church decided to sponsor the family and assurance forms were completed on their behalf and filed with the proper agencies. Then, one day a letter of thanks and appreciation came from the father of the family in Europe, but in it he also mentioned that he was a Roman Catholic. Needless to say there was much concern and discussion as to the wise course to follow because the minister, L. Roy Cronkhite, and his people felt they wanted to sponsor a Protestant family. They also realized that "few things could be more cruel than to build up the hopes of any family and then dash them to the earth." However, the church as such decided it could not complete the sponsorship under the circumstances. The minister and the committee sought the assistance of the local priest but without success.

In the meantime frank and prayerful correspondence was carried on with the family in Europe. "We thought that we

(Continued on page 3, col. 3)

Two Worlds — Or Three?

It is generally agreed that if this world is to survive it must survive as one world — with a one-world mind and a one-world political organization. The United Nations is the brave but as yet unfulfilled promise of this unity. In the meantime, competing with the purpose of the United Nations, two forces have been desperately trying to organize the world. Moscow has succeeded to a remarkable degree in pulling into her orbit a formidable number of nations. And in response to this effort, the Western nations, led by the United States, has made and is making an equally desperate effort to organize a world opposing this Soviet world. Thus a "two-power world" if not two distinct worlds, has been the most important outward fact of recent years.

Have we come to the breakup of this two-power world? Mr. Walter Lippmann, in one of the most important articles on foreign policy in many years, in *The Atlantic* (April 1950), holds that we have; and moreover that we should actively seek to promote such a movement.

The premise of this thesis is that our effort to organize an over-balance of the world against Russia, set forth in the Truman Doctrine and its corollary, the military containment of Russia, have failed. This is evident, he thinks, in six crucial recent developments: (1) the end of American monopoly of the atom bomb; (2) the successful revolution of Mao Tse-tung in China; (3) the dissolution of the British and Dutch empires in Southern Asia and the rise of India, Pakistan and Indonesia; (4) the loss of control over southeastern Asia (Indochina, Malaya, Burma) by the Europeans and the present anarchy there; (5) the secession of Tito from the Soviet orbit and the tendency of this movement to spread through other Eastern European Communist states; and (6) the revival of Germany as a world power.

He sees in the last five of these a common denominator — namely, the unwillingness of any of these areas, which lie between the centers of Moscow and Washington, to align themselves with either of these two parties. This interpretation has been greatly strengthened since this article appeared. India, Pakistan and Indonesia have declared that they are going to remain neutral. And as to Europe, Harold Callender, reporting to the *New York Times* (May 14) from Paris, states that French officials are worried by the success of Communists in France in spearheading a "peace" campaign, and by the response of the people to the arguments for a

(Continued on page 4, col. 3)

SOCIAL ACTION NEWS-LETTER

Published monthly, except for joint July-August issue, by the Department of Social Welfare, The United Christian Missionary Society, 222 South Downey Avenue, Indianapolis 7, Indiana.

Subscription price \$1.00 per year.

Entered as second class mail matter September 2, 1943, at Indianapolis, Indiana, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Editorial Staff

James A. Crain Walter W. Sikes
Mrs. Ruth Estes Milner
Printed by Moeller Printing Co., member of Typographical Union No. 1

The opinions and points of view expressed in this publication are those of the editors and do not necessarily represent The United Christian Missionary Society.

Church Peace Group Issues Affirmation

The Conference on the Church and War, held in Detroit, Michigan, May 8-11, adopted at its closing session "An Affirmation and Appeal" to the churches on behalf of world peace. The text follows:

"Man in the moment of his greatest scientific achievement faces the possibility of total self-destruction. To many, war seems the only answer. We believe that another way, grounded in the will of God, is open. In this hour of confusion and turmoil, the church is called upon to speak a distinctive and steady word, drawn not from the judgment of the secular world, but from its Gospel.

"The insistent and absolute call of Christ is to His cross. It is a call to repentance and commitment — repentance for our involvement in war and commitment to the power of His reconciling love.

"We, therefore, appeal to the Church of Christ throughout the world to break with war — to repent of warmaking now. We appeal to the American churches to take the initiative in this crucial witness.

"We appeal to individual Christians to refuse to make or to use weapons of destruction, and to devote their energies to the removal of the social, economic and moral causes of depression, dictatorship and war.

"We advocate that individual Christians and the Church support the use of the methods of reconciliation and non-violent action, such as Ghandi has demonstrated in our time.

"Let the Church own no Lord but Christ, no power but the Cross, no hope but in the God Who bears the destiny of all in His hands."

Over 400 delegates representing 17 organized religious peace groups attended. Among the featured speakers were A. J. Muste, who advocated local cells of Christians who would think of themselves as "Third Order of St. Francis volunteers" to persuade other Christians to adopt non-violent techniques in the struggle for social justice, Clarence Pickett, Dean Walter G. Muelder, E. Raymond Wilson, Dr. Culbert G. Rutenberg, and John Nevin Sayre.

Washington Round-Up

Draft Extension

On April 26, Rep. Carl D. Vinson (D. Ga.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee announced that he had reversed a previous decision and would call up his H.R. 6826 for hearing. This bill extends the Draft Act for two years. Late in February Vinson announced that he would support another bill (H.R. 7442) which he had introduced to provide for registration of all males on reaching the age of 18 and to provide standby manpower mobilization machinery.

Expensive and Unnecessary

As a means of providing manpower for the armed forces in peacetime the draft has proved both expensive and unnecessary. Under the present two-year extension which expires on June 30, and which Rep. Vinson proposes to extend on a standby basis for another two years, only 30,049 men were drafted and these only in the first month of the extended period. After that its operation was suspended because the number of volunteers provided all the men the military budget could support. A break down of figures shows that it cost the government \$914 for each man drafted. The 1948 figures on voluntary enlistment show a cost of \$134.70 each. Nevertheless both the President and the armed forces are insistent upon the draft, not so much as a device to get men into the military service as a potential weapon in the cold war.

Deficit Spending

Late estimates put the government's deficit for the fiscal year ending June 30, at \$6.7 billion. Notwithstanding recent drives for economy, Defense Secretary Louis Johnson, who himself has in recent months frequently declared that economy is needed in the defense department and can be had without affecting the essential soundness of the nation's military position, went before the House Appropriations Committee on April 26, and asked for a \$350 million increase in the 1951 military budget. The committee approved the request 30 minutes later.

Genocide Convention

On April 12, a sub-committee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee recommended that the U.N. Convention (treaty) outlawing genocide ("acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part, a national, ethical, racial, or religious group, as such") be approved by the Foreign Relations Committee as a whole and recommended to the Senate for ratification. The sub-committee listed four "understandings" which become, if adopted by the Senate, an American interpretation of the Convention. None affect the general significance of the treaty, one of which was designed to meet the concern of some Senators that such matters as lynching be kept under local jurisdiction. In the press of legislation as adjournment nears this treaty may not be ratified unless its friends press for action. Thirteen nations have ratified. Twenty are required to put it into effect.

Atlantic Pact Time-Table

On May 19, the foreign ministers of the US, Britain and France closed a four-day conference in London on implementation of the Atlantic Pact. Their decisions were based on the assumption that the Russian rearmament program will be complete by 1953 or 1954 and that the Western Powers will be in a precarious position if by that time their own defenses are not strong enough to deter an aggressor.

The foreign ministers set up a six-point program of defense of Western Europe in case of Soviet attack.

1. Creation of a permanent council of deputy foreign ministers to sit continuously in London to coordinate plans for making the Atlantic Pact notions militarily strong and economically sound. The new council of deputies head will be an American named by President Truman.

2. To seek on a limited basis a balanced international fighting force in the Atlantic area to replace the existing collection of national armies, navies and air forces. National forces outside the Atlantic area, such as Southeast Asia, will not be affected.

3. Agreement that more mutual military assistance is needed to build up Western defenses and recommendation that each country make its full contribution. This is designed to relieve the US of carrying the full load.

4. Coordination of adequate military forces and financial costs on the theory that the resources of the Atlantic Powers are sufficient, if coordinated, to allow rapid rearmament without impairing social and economic progress.

5. Establishment of a new North Atlantic planning board for ocean shipping resembling the war-time "bridge of ships."

6. Announcement that the US and Canada will join informally with the Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC) to link the economies of North America and Europe more effectively in the two years remaining before the Marshall Plan expires.

Lobbying as Big Business

Sidelight on lobbying as a lucrative profession was given before the House Lobby Investigating Committee on May 19, by Samuel P. Haines, of Indianapolis, Indiana, who testified that he has a contract with the "20 Per Cent Cabaret Tax Committee," a group of cabaret and hotel men who operate dine and dance rooms, which will pay him \$100,000 if Congress reduces the cabaret tax to 5 percent. His contract calls for a retainer fee of \$10,000 and \$15,000 for expenses, with an additional \$25,000 to help ram through any bill, amendment or rider introduced, plus \$35,000 if the tax is reduced to 10 percent, and \$100,000 if he gets it lowered to 5 percent. Haines admitted that he had already received \$43,000 and had a bill for \$7000 more ready to submit. Authorities say there is nothing illegal about Haines' contract. The exposure illustrates how pressure groups operate in Congress and in State legislatures, where Haines' past efforts have largely centered.

On Social Frontiers

World Council Assembly at Evanston
 On May 7 Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam of New York Area of The Methodist Church and one of six Presidents of the World Council of Churches, announced the second Assembly of the World Council will be held at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, in the summer of 1953. The first Assembly was held at Amsterdam in August 1948. Detailed plans will be formulated at the annual meeting, July 8-15, 1950 in Toronto, of 90-member Central Committee of the Council.

* * *

It Makes a Difference!

Charles A. Wells' *Between the Lines* reports that a FBI man submitted to one of Congressional committees investigating Communism a list of members of Congress whose names had been found among supporters of an organization charged with being of Communist origin. Not a single word appeared in the press. It is perfectly reasonable to assume that these congressmen made their contributions during the war years or before the organizations in question had been declared subversive. Yet when the names of liberal congressmen are found on the same or comparable lists for the same reasons a howl goes up to high heaven. A Washington attorney tells of defending a young woman government office clerk who was charged before the President's Loyalty Board with attending a meeting of a Communist-front organization. Testimony brought out that she attended such a meeting in 1936 — to hear Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt speak!

* * *

It Happened in New Orleans

The *New York Times* tells it, on April 20, when a jury found George Foster, 40 restaurateur and hotel man, not guilty of a murder charge, Criminal District Judge Frank T. Echezabel, who had heard rumors that if the defendant were found guilty he would be shot, stepped down from the bench, spread his judicial robes to shield the prisoner and declared to the crowded courtroom, "If any attempt is made to injure or kill the defendant it must be done through my body." As the guilty prisoner was led from the courtroom Judge Echezabel walked behind him, shielding him with his robes.

* * *

Foreign Students Come

There are now 26,433 foreign students in the United States, according to Donald Shank, vice-president of the Institute of International Education. They represent 125 countries and are enrolled in 100 educational institutions. New York has 4,478 in 120 educational institutions, while California ranks second with 2,999 institutions. The University of California has the largest number of foreign students of any American university, 1,111. New York University is second with 1,000, while Columbia comes close with 900. Most Disciples of Christ colleges have 50 or more foreign students enrolled.

DPs Make Good, Says IRO

Most DPs are making good Americans, says Miss Ruth Safran, public relations officer of the International Refugee Organization, the agency of the United Nations responsible for resettlement of European Displaced Persons. Under the Displaced Persons Act more than 145,000 DPs have been brought to the U.S. in the past 18 months. Each was obligated to have a sponsor who certified that he had a job, suitable housing and that the DP would not become a public charge.

Miss Safran surveyed 5000 cases and reports that the DPs are rapidly becoming Americanized. Eighty percent over 21 years of age have applied for citizenship papers. Nearly all of the children were enrolled in school as soon as possible and many of them have already begun to speak English. Most of the adults are studying either in night school or at home. Many attend trade schools, and many have made contacts with the church of their choice.

In her report Miss Safran said, "Seventy-five percent of those I surveyed were adults and 65 percent were wage-earners. Considering what they have been through they have retained an astonishing amount of bounce. They make the most of everything — fix up their homes well and take pride in them. Most of them take to American food and clothes. They take pride in paying their income tax — those few who have come to that point."

Many individuals and families have come to these shores under sponsorship of church organizations.

J.A.C.

American Family Incomes

One-fourth of the families in the U.S. are definitely not living on Easy Street, despite the complaint about wage demands of labor unions. The Bureau of the Census has just released income figures covering 38,537,000 families for the year 1948. Of this number, 4,100,000 (10.6 percent) received incomes of less than \$1,000. Another 5,600,000 had between \$1,000 and \$2,000. That is to say, 9,700,000 families in the U.S. (25.1 percent of the total) in 1948 received incomes of less than \$2,000 and almost half of them less than \$1,000. Some 20,900,000 families (54.2 percent) received between \$2,000 and \$5,000; 6,900,000 (18 percent) received between \$5,000 and \$10,000, while only 2.9 percent (1,100,000 families) received more than \$10,000 per family.

The median income for the year was \$3,200, the highest in the history of the nation. This should be viewed in relation to the fact that the cost of living was also at an alltime high, so that actual purchasing power was no higher than before.

2,700,000 families were headed by women and 34,800,000 by men. If figures on individual church membership (53 percent of the total population) can be taken as a guide, approximately 20,405,000 American families have some tie with the church.

Summer Staff - Migrant Program

As in past years, the department of social welfare is cooperating with the mid-west regional office of the Home Missions Council in the selection of Disciples young people for summer work among agricultural migrants. We are happy to list here the names of those who have been selected, together with their colleges and tentative field assignments: Shirley Anderson, school teacher, Macalester, Minn. to Fairmont, Martin County, Minn. June Dugweed, Eureka, unassigned. Marilyn Dugweed, Eureka, to Grand Forks, N.D. Barbara Ann Hoskin, Hiram, to Fremont, O. John Hoyopatubbi, Phillips, to Blue Earth, Minn. Barbara L. Jester, Macalester College, to North Dakota. Bill Lewis and Dorothy Wilson Lewis, Phillips, to Hoopeston, Ill. Mary A. Nibbe, Kansas Univ., to Sanilac County, Mich. Ella Williams, HMC Staff, to Grand Junction, Mich. Lois Mae Young, Iowa State College, to Marshall, Mich.

These young people with some forty others will meet for a week's training conference at Camp Warren, Michigan, the second week of June. From this week of orientation they will go direct to their assignment. Their term of service runs from two and one-half to three months.

Such a program requires great adaptability on the part of each young person, depth of religious insight and a burning desire to serve regardless of the circumstances involved.

R.E.M.

They Sponsor DPs (Cont'd from p 1, c 2)

all are equally children of God . . . We would not put you to any trouble, therefore, we ask you to take back your assurance or give it for any other Protestant family . . . If we ourselves resign, the IRO would refuse any assistance for us considering the question of emigrating."

So a Protestant family is coming on that assurance — BUT — the story is not ended!

The good minister and some business friends felt very responsible for this family and began a program of sponsorship as a group of friends. Result: three business men guaranteed employment; the county ministerial association of the Disciples of Christ agreed to pay house rent for one year and cost of transportation from port of entry to Niantic. The house — the only one available in Niantic — already has been rented and the community is busy putting it in shape for its new occupants. "This is a kind hearted people living in our small community and I believe we will do the square thing by any family which comes to us," writes Mr. Cronkhite.

"Now with this new set of sponsors for the Catholic family, our small community will be taking two DP families which is quite an undertaking but one I believe which will receive the blessing of God."

There has been a beautiful Christian spirit manifested by all parties involved which has produced a healthy and happy solution.

R.E.M.

Have we Given (Cont'd from p 1, c 1)

\$6 billion annually until Western defense forces are built up. The mid-May meeting of the foreign ministers of the United States, France and Great Britain was designed to spell out just what that cost will be.

Important too, as a straw in the wind, is the frank talk now going on everywhere about what Russia plans to do when her rearmament is complete in 1953. Those who speak and write in this fashion overlook the fact that Soviet Russia has her own problems to deal with, problems which, if her increasing police repression means anything, are growing more acute. They speak also as if Russia, which has only 25 percent of the productive capacity of the United States, is getting ready to attack us at once. John Foster Dulles, who certainly has had unusual opportunities to study international affairs in the past thirty years, says that all evidence points to the conclusion that war is not now imminent. The Soviet leaders, he says, have not yet consolidated their position, have not yet succeeded in breaking the spirit of their peoples, have not yet exhausted the possibilities of their cold war offensive, especially in Asia, and are not yet industrially equipped to wage a major war against the United States. War might come, he says, if and when Soviet leaders successfully combine Eastern Europe and Asia into a political and military unity and complete the "encirclement" phase of their strategy, or if our own people become panicky and feel that they must precipitate a shooting war as the only means of breaking the ever-tightening Soviet noose. "If we wish to avoid the utter disaster of war, we had better have at hand some good tools for waging a non-shooting war."

The danger arises primarily from the last of the two possibilities named by Mr. Dulles. Russia has not yet successfully combined her Eastern European and Asiatic conquests, nor is she prepared industrially to make war upon us. But the failure of President Truman's "containment" policy has thrown us into confusion and has seemingly robbed us of the power of initiative. We are on the defensive in every theatre throughout the world. The great danger is that we may seize the initiative in the one area in which we perhaps hold the initiative, namely, that of a shooting war. If we do it will not be from deliberate choice, but from frustration — perhaps from some act such as the recently hinted at sinking of an unidentified submarine or the shooting down of one of our planes. There is ample evidence that Soviet leaders are deliberately goading us with the hope that we shall strike first and thus permit them to stand before the peoples of the world as defenders against aggression. The fact that we are losing the cold war and seemingly do not have the ingenuity either to make good on the promises of democracy or to persuade the

underprivileged peoples that democracy offers hope, makes resort to a shooting war perhaps a desperate alternative.

While no official announcement has been made or any indication given by the Administration, much of the evidence seems to point to the conclusion that the United States has given up hope of peace through the United Nations, of disarmament through international agreement, of international control of atomic energy, and without official announcement, fanfare or consultation, has embarked upon a program of rearmament in preparation for eventualities. Down that road lies Disaster written in letters of fire. J.A.C.

Two Worlds (Cont'd from p 1, c 3)

"neutral" France and Western Europe.

These arguments Mr. Lippman presents with much force. His case, stated with regrettable over-simplicity, is that all these peripheral peoples know very well that neither Russia nor the coalition around the United States can protect them, whatever efforts or arrangements are made. This reaction based on fear is re-inforced by the natural longing of every people to be independent; and hence the development of national consciousness supports this disintegration of the two-power world.

Neutrality and the Atlantic Treaty

When one considers this thesis in the light of the recent four-day meeting of the Foreign Ministers in London and the preliminary and parallel conferences held to implement the Atlantic Treaty, a number of significant matters appear.

The first one is that the central problem before this meeting was not solved. That was, according to Drew Middleton of the *New York Times* (May 15), reporting from London, "how the rearmament of Western Europe can be accomplished without imperilling economic recovery." And Raymond Daniell, at the conclusion of the conference, remarked that what the military had asked for "staggered the foreign ministers." Indeed, this "great gap" between "what the soldiers say they need" and "what their financial experts say they can afford" was the most emphasized aspect of the situation in press reports interpreting the conference.

Premier George Bidault of France asked for "a high Atlantic council for peace," Harold Callender stated; and he was supported by Foreign Minister Schuman, who wants this council to "specifically dissociate itself from the military North Atlantic Treaty." It should, according to M. Schuman, include those nations ready to join for economic recovery but not militarily. Otherwise, Mr. Callender implies, these French officials see "a new split in Europe" between those who desire to maintain the concept of unity for military defense and those who desire unity primarily for economic recovery.

Furthermore, Mr. Callender says "The key to the French attitude . . . is to be found in the anxiety aroused in France by the constant talk in the United States

of the 'cold war' and the resulting tendency to concentrate attention on military preparations," in the fear that this "may heighten tension between Moscow and the West or may lead to an arms program that will compromise economic recovery by imposing impossible financial burdens."

The foreign ministers were unable to find any formula by which to resolve this impasse. Accordingly, they created a "permanent board of strategy," to be headed by an American, to solve the problem.

Another angle from which the whole matter of the relations of Moscow and the West is viewed, is succinctly analysed in a copyrighted column of May 21, by Major General George Fielding Eliot. His case is that the problem to build a Western Europe capable of resisting Russian attack can be solved only when it allows a strong German industry and that this is possible only by giving the Germans the incentive of assurance that their country and its industry can and will be defended. His conclusion, which he declares America, Britain and France yet ignores — at least publicly — is that this can be done only by a strong and rearmed Germany.

The military are agreed — and this was the accepted premise in the London meeting — that the West must have 30 divisions available for immediate action in Europe to counter-balance the 50 or 60 divisions of Russia. We now have only 13½ divisions. The financial situation is such that not more than 21 divisions are possible from the West Europe nations. Where are the other 9 or 10 divisions to come from? The United States has only 2 divisions now in Germany. Eliot's conclusion is that Germany must provide at least half of this balance. And he declares that on one point the military of all these nations agree — the defense of Germany requires a German army.

But this statement of the case ignores the real problem, and one which becomes more urgent month by month: Can any amount of military power really protect these in-between countries? The answer is obviously, No. One European journalist reported some time ago that the French were putting it facetiously in saying that while France might well endure another occupation she could never survive another liberation.

And it grows ever more apparent that any effort to defend militarily the whole periphery of the Communist world will produce such economic distress as may well produce the very evils against which such defense is aimed.

From the standpoint of national policy this terrible dilemma may actually offer no escape. But Lippmann holds that our best hope is to cultivate as broad a neutral belt as possible and concentrate our attention on the prevention of success on the part of Russia to consolidate her position. This would certainly point toward an emphasis upon the economic and social welfare of these peoples rather than upon concentration upon military strength.